By way of example, the Statement appears to indicate that each of independent claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 17 includes a routing step that itself comprises a substituting step and a routing step. However, this is not the case. The Examiner in formulating the Statement is apparently attempting to set forth limitations of independent claim 1, but the particular asserted limitations are not present in claims 3, 6, 9 or 17.

Furthermore, the Examiner in the last paragraph on page 2 of the Notice indicates that claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 17 are allowable because of the stated limitations from claim 1 "in combination with other limitations" from other independent claims. The Examiner thus appears to be combining limitations from one independent claim with those from another in indicating his reasons for allowance, which is clearly improper.

Applicants therefore believe that the Statement mischaracterizes the actual claim language in that none of the independent claims 3, 6, 9 and 17 includes the specific language recited by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner, in attempting to paraphrase the claimed invention, has introduced language into the Statement that does not accurately reflect the actual claim language.

In summary, Applicants believe that each of the independent claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 17 is allowable because the particular limitations thereof are not taught or suggested by the art of record. To the extent that the Statement includes language which deviates from the actual language used in the particular limitations of these claims, or language which characterizes the prior art in a manner inconsistent with the position of Applicants, the Statement is respectfully traversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 11, 2005

Joseph B. Ryan

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Ryan

Reg. No. 37,922

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP

90 Forest Avenue

Locust Valley, NY 11560

(516) 759-7517